

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Extension of Time

A request for a one month extension of the period for response to the office action mailed on September 19, 2006 is enclosed. The extended period for response expires on January 19, 2006.

Claim Status

Claims 1-29 were previously presented. Claims 1, 7-10, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28 are amended. Claims 11, 15, 24 and 26 are canceled. Claim 30 is added. Thus, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-23, 25 and 27-30 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kubo (US 4,896,349) in view of Fawal (US 6,452,938). Claims 2-4 and 6-29 are rejected as obvious over Kubo and Fawal in view of Yamano. In response, independent claims 1, 10, 17 and 23 are amended to clearly distinguish over Kubo, Fawal and Yamano.

Each of the independent claims now requires a first filter coupled between the first output coil and first transceiver circuit, wherein the first output coil passes the entire input signal but the first filter allows only a first range of frequencies (ADSL) to pass through to the first transceiver circuit. Likewise, a second filter is required that is coupled between the second output coil and second transceiver circuit, wherein the second output coil passes the entire input signal but the second filter allows only a second range of frequencies (LAN) to pass through to the second transceiver circuit.

Kubo discloses a transformer 25 having an input coil 25a, an output coil 25b coupled via coaxial cable 16 to communication apparatuses 8 and 9, computer 12 and television 13, and an output coil 25c coupled via wires 17 to communication apparatuses 10 and 11, sensor 14 and meter 15. There are no filters coupled between output coils 25b and 25c, and the various communication apparatuses. Thus, the same signal input to coil 25a and output by coils 25b and 25c will also be

provided to communication apparatuses 8 and 9 via coaxial cable 16, and to communication apparatuses 10 and 11 via wires 17.

Kubo provides no suggestion that filters might be coupled to the output coils 25b and 25c in order to provide different signals to the components coupled to cable 16 and wires 17, respectively. To the contrary, Kubo teaches against such a configuration since it explicitly states, at column 5, lines 52-55, that:

Therefore, the pulse signal as same as the above-mentioned pulse singal on the coaxial cable 16, is supplied to the pair of wires 17.

Fawal is cited only for its disclosure of an integrated transformer, and does not remedy the deficiencies of Kubo in this regard.

With respect to Yamano, the Action cites column 5, lines 11-16 and Figure 4 in regards to its disclosure of a filter. However, the filter disclosed by Yamano in this passage and figure is a low pass filter 124 in a signal path that does not even include a transformer. This does not teach or suggest applicant's configuration of a first bandpass filter coupled to the output of a first output coil to pass only ADSL frequencies *and* a second bandpass filter coupled to the output of a second output coil to pass only LAN frequencies.

The Action also cites column 7, lines 4-15 and Figure 11 of Yamano in regards to disclosure of a filter. However, the filter disclosed by Yamano in this passage and figure is a bandpass filter 141 that is coupled to the single coil side of transformer T1 (see Fig. 12b). The coils on the other side of transformer T1 are coupled to transmit TX and receive RX lines of an analog front end 142. There is no disclosure or suggestion that these two coils might be connected to filters each having different bandpass ranges so that one passes only an ADSL signal and the other passes only a LAN signal.

Since no disclosure or suggestion of this element is found in any of Kubo, Fawal or Yamano, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-23, 25 and 27-29 cannot be rendered

obvious by these references. The rejections under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

In addition to the amendments to the independent claims, the dependent claims have been amended, and canceled where necessary, in order to be consistent with the amendments to the independent claims.

New Claim 30


New claim 30 depends from claim 1 is directed to the embodiment shown in applicant's Figure 3 which includes subtraction circuits. Such a configuration is shown in none of the cited references. Thus, claim 30 is allowable for this reason in addition to the reasons set forth above for claim 1.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: January 19, 2006

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701